



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/647,547	01/03/2001	Stefan Grinneby	197593US2PCT	8008

22850 7590 02/09/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

DINH, MINH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2132

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/647,547	GRINNEBY, STEFAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Minh Dinh	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment received on 9/20/04.

The specification and figure 1 have been amended. Claims 1-44 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 16, filed 9/20/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4, 16-19 and 32-35 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 5-15, 20-31 and 36-44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, a discovery of new prior art has necessitated new grounds of rejection. The delay in citation of the newly discovered prior art is regretted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2132

4. Claims 1-4, 8, 32-35 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Riggins (6,766,454).

Regarding claims 1, 16 and 32 (claim 1 being exemplary), Riggins discloses a telecommunications system adapted to provide a visitor's computer with access to at least one application, comprising: an application computer storing at least one application (fig. 1, elements 108 a-c); a firewall protecting said application computer (fig. 1, elements 104, 120); an administration computer linked to said application computer (fig. 1, element 16), said administration computer adapted to generate a set of applets which meet the limitation of an electronic badge and adapted to transmit said electronic badge to the visitor's computer (fig. 5, step 530), said electronic badge including a password conferring access of the visitor's computer through said firewall to said at least one application (col. 4, lines 60-65; col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 7; col. 9, lines 5-20).

Regarding claims 2, 17 and 33, Riggins further discloses that the administration computer and the application computer are realized on a single data processing machine (col. 9, lines 55-59).

Regarding claims 3, 18 and 34, Riggins further discloses that the administration computer and the application computer are distinct data processing machines (fig. 1, elements 106 and 108 a-b) and said firewall is located in said administration computer (col. 6, lines 5-15).

Regarding claims 4, 19 and 35, Riggins further discloses that the administration computer is protected by a firewall (fig. 1, element 104).

Regarding claims 8, 23 and 39, Riggins further discloses that the administration computer is protected by a firewall (fig. 1, element 104).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-13, 20-23, 25-27 and 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins as applied to claims 1, 16 and 32 above, and further in view of Hudson et al. (6,055,637).

Regarding claims 5, 20 and 36, Riggins does not disclose a single applet for accessing all authorized services. However, Riggins discloses a set of applets downloaded together and each responsible for accessing a separate authorized service. It is well known in the art that a large program can comprise multiple modules each performing a separate task for ease of development and maintenance. In addition, the applets implemented in the Riggins reference meet the definition of a Java applet in that applets are small programs. Therefore, the Riggins set of applets meets the limitation of the claimed applet. Riggins discloses that the applet contains an identifier (col. 4, lines 60-65; col. 9, lines 5-20). However, Riggins does not disclose that the applet contains a list of access rights. Hudson discloses a system for controlling access to

Art Unit: 2132

resources utilizing a credential token that contains a user ID, a password and a list of access right (col. 2, line 67 – col. 3, line 4; lines 23-28, 31-38); the token allows authorized access to resources, so it is functionally equivalent to an electronic badge. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Riggins such that the electronic badge contains a list of access rights, as taught by Hudson. The motivation for doing so would have been that the access control system of each service needs not permanently store information associated with user and therefore, user information may be updated quickly and efficiently (col. 1, lines 42-48; col. 6, lines 23-27).

Regarding claims 6, 21 and 37, Hudson's list of access rights of claim 5 permits access to additional applications (col. 3, lines 4-5 and fig. 1).

Regarding claims 7, 22 and 38, Riggins further discloses that the applet is adapted to run on the visitor's computer and cause one or more icons to be displayed (col. 5, lines 32-42).

Regarding claims 8, 23 and 39, Riggins further discloses a Web server adapted to issue electronic badges (fig. 3, elements 387, 388). Riggins does not disclose that the administration computer includes a control panel. Hudson discloses an administrator issuing credential token utilizing a security database, the token allows authorized access to resources, so it is functionally equivalent to an electronic badge (see Abstract; col. 4, lines 50-58). Hudson does not explicitly disclose that the administration computer includes a control panel. However, this feature is deemed to be inherent to the Hudson system. The administrator would not be able to issue

Art Unit: 2132

credential token without a control panel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Riggins such that the administration computer includes a control panel adapted to issue electronic badges, as taught by Hudson, and accordingly, the control panel is linked to the Web server. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the administrator to perform issuing of tokens.

Regarding claims 9, 25 and 40, Riggins does not disclose that the administration computer includes a control server linked to the control panel and a database of access rules linked to the control server. Hudson further discloses that the administration computer of claim 8 includes a control server linked to the control panel and a database of access rules linked to the control server (see fig. 3, col. 4, lines 55-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Riggins such that the administration computer includes a control server linked to the control panel and a database of access rules linked to the control server, as taught by Hudson. The motivation for doing so would have been that the administrator could have access to users' identification and authorization information.

Regarding claims 10, 26 and 41, Riggins further discloses that the administration computer comprises a firewall protecting the application computer (col. 6, lines 5-15; col. 9, lines 55-59).

Regarding claims 11, 27 and 42, Riggins discloses that access to the Web server is controlled by password protection (fig. 14, step 1410).

Regarding claims 12 and 43, Riggins further discloses that the electronic badge is deposited for collection on the Web server (fig. 3, elements 387, 388).

Regarding claim 13, Riggins further discloses that the visitor's computer can download said electronic badge by accessing said web server and by giving a password and visitor identification (fig. 14, step 1410).

7. Claims 14 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins in view of Hudson as applied to claim 8 and 36 above, and further in view of Scheifler et al. (6,138,238). Riggins and Hudson do not disclose that the access rights associated with the electronic badge can be changed dynamically. Scheifler discloses a system regulating access to resources in which access rights associated with a principle can be changed dynamically (col. 4, lines 26-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Riggins and Hudson such that the access rights associated with the electronic badge can be changed dynamically, as taught by Scheifler, so that the security in computer systems could be enhanced (col. 4, lines 54-56).

8. Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins in view of Hudson as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Montulli (5,774,670). Riggins and Hudson do not disclose that the electronic badge is deleted by a signal from the control server. Montulli discloses a cookie being deleted by a signal from a server; the cookie is functionally equivalent to the electronic badge (col. 9, lines 34-41).

Art Unit: 2132

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Riggins and Hudson such that the electronic badge is deleted by a signal from the control server, as taught by Montulli, so that the server (col. 4, lines 54-56) so that the server could remove undesired cookies previously sent to a client.

9. Claims 24 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins in view of Hudson as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Daly et al. (5,875,394)

Regarding claim 24, Riggins and Hudson do not disclose the steps of establishing a voice link over the PSTN between the user of the visitor's computer and an operator at the administration center, the operator verifying the user and assigning and communicating a password to the user over the voice link. Daly discloses a process for securely assigning a password comprising the steps of establishing a voice link over the PSTN between a user and an operator at the administration center, the operator verifying the user and assigning and communicating a password to the user over the voice link (see fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Riggins and Hudson to include the steps of establishing a voice link over the PSTN between the user of the visitor's computer and an operator at the administration center, the operator verifying the user and assigning and communicating a password to the user over the voice link, as taught by Daly, in order to avoid the risk of piracy (col. 2, lines 33-36).

Regarding claim 28, Riggins further discloses that the electronic badge is deposited for collection on the Web server (fig. 3, elements 387, 388).

Regarding claim 29, Riggins further discloses that the visitor enters said password to download said electronic badge (fig. 14, step 1410).

10. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins, Hudson and Daly as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Susaki et al. (6,189,032). Riggins, Hudson and Daly do not disclose the steps of said visitor requesting access, while connected to said application computer, to a first software application, not pre-authorized on said electronic visitor's badge, said control panel giving an alarm condition, said host confirming over said voice link that the said visitor has requested access to the first software application, and modifying the access rights associated with the electronic visitor's badge via said control panel. Susaki discloses a method for controlling access rights to services comprising the steps of a user requesting access, while connected to said application computer, to a service, not pre-authorized according to the user's access rights, giving an alarm condition, confirming that the user has requested access to the service, and modifying the access rights associated with the user (col. 3, lines 41-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Riggins, Hudson and Daly to include the steps of said visitor requesting access, while connected to said application computer, to a first software application, not pre-authorized on said electronic visitor's badge, said control panel giving an alarm

Art Unit: 2132

condition, said host confirming over said voice link that the said visitor has requested access to the first software application, and modifying the access rights associated with the electronic visitor's badge via said control panel, as taught by Susaki, so that access to services that need approval and consent by another party could properly be controlled (col. 3, lines 55-59).

11. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins, Hudson and Daly as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Montulli. Riggins, Hudson and Daly do not disclose that the electronic badge is deleted by a signal from the control server. Montulli discloses a cookie being deleted by a signal from a server; the cookie is functionally equivalent to the electronic badge (col. 9, lines 34-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Riggins, Hudson and Daly such that the electronic badge is deleted by a signal from the control server, as taught by Montulli, so that the server (col. 4, lines 54-56) so that the server could remove undesired cookies previously sent to a client.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-3802. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 10:00am-6:30pm.

Art Unit: 2132


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MD

Minh Dinh
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

MD
2/4/05


GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100